# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 10/821,608 | 04/09/2004 | Anuraag Agrawal | CING-0648/887.US | 1558 |

54499          7590          10/09/2007

WOODCOCK WASHBURN LLP
CIRA CENTRE 12th Floor
2929 ARCH STREET
PHILADELPHIA, PA 19104-2891

| EXAMINER |
|---|
| TIV, BACKHEAN |

| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|---|---|
| 2151 | |

| MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
|---|---|
| 10/09/2007 | PAPER |

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

| | Application No. | Applicant(s) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| **Office Action Summary** | 10/821,608 | AGRAWAL ET AL. |
| | **Examiner** | **Art Unit** | |
| | Backhean Tiv | 2151 | |

*-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --*

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _4/9/04_.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.      2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-40_ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _1-40_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on _09 April 2004_ is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☒ All    b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) ☐ Other: _____.

## Detailed Action

Claims 1-40 are pending in this application.

## Drawings

The Drawings filed on 4/9/04 are acceptable.

## Content of Specification

The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

The applicant did not include the patent application number of the copending

applications, paragraph 0001.

The specification also is missing the Brief Summary of the Invention: See MPEP

§ 608.01(d). A brief summary or general statement of the invention as set forth in 37

CFR 1.73. The summary is separate and distinct from the abstract and is directed

toward the invention rather than the disclosure as a whole. The summary may point out

the advantages of the invention or how it solves problems previously existent in the prior

art (and preferably indicated in the Background of the Invention). In chemical cases it

should point out in general terms the utility of the invention. If possible, the nature and

gist of the invention or the inventive concept should be set forth. Objects of the

invention should be treated briefly and only to the extent that they contribute to an

understanding of the invention.

Appropriate correction is required.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly
claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 12-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 12-16 recites the limitation "the completed user". There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-3,6,12-19,28,29,33,34,36,37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Publication 2004/0087326 issued to Dunko et al.(Dunko) in view of *Microsoft Internet Explorer 5 in 24 Hours*, Jill T. Freeze, Sams Publishing Copyright 1999.

As per claim 1, Dunko teaches an a telecommunications system having at least one network gateway coupled among multiple mobile devices and a network, and wherein a content sharing system and a content provider are also coupled to the network, a method of sharing content between a user and a recipient, both of whom have a mobile device having access to the network(Fig.1,Fig.2), the method comprising:

receiving a request message, wherein the request message is generated, at least in part, by the content provider, the request message comprising: information

identifying the content sharing system, and information identifying content provided by the content provider, wherein the user selected the identified content as content that the user wishes to share with the recipient(para.0004,0042,0044);

and based on the received information, generating a content share message for transmittal to the mobile device of the recipient, wherein the content share message includes an indication of the identified content that the user wishes to share with the recipient, so that the content can be presented on the mobile device of the recipient(Abstract, para.0004, 0042).

Dunko however does not explicitly teach providing a user input form for display to the user, wherein the user input form includes a request for the user to identify the recipient; receiving user input information submitted by the user via the user input form.

Freeze teaches a user input form for display to the user, wherein the user input form includes a request for the user to identify the recipient(page 101-103); receiving user input information submitted by the user via the user input form(page 101-103).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Dunko to include a user input form for display to the user, wherein the user input form includes a request for the user to identify the recipient; receiving user input information submitted by the user via the user input form as taught by Freeze in order to send an email to a user.

One ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have been motivated to combine the teachings of Dunko and Freeze in order to provide a system to send content through an email.

As per claim 2, the method of claim 1 wherein the user selected the identified content from the mobile device of the user(Dunko, para.0025).

As per claim 3, the method of claim 1 wherein the user selected the identified content from a device other than a mobile device(Dunko, para.0025).

As per claim 6, the method of claim 1 further comprising providing access to an address book application coupled to the content sharing system, wherein the address book application facilitates the user's identification of the recipient(Freeze, page 214-219). Motivation to combine set forth in claim 1.

As per claim 12, Dunko teaches mobile device registered with a mobile service provider, the mobile device comprising: means for receiving user input(Figs.1-16); means for providing output; memory means(Figs.1-16); radio transceiver and processing means coupled to the memory means; and wherein the mobile device is smaller than a laptop or tablet computer(Figs.1-16), and further comprises: means for presenting content via an output component of the mobile device, wherein the content is provided by a content provider and sharing the content with other mobile device users(para. 0004,0042,0044); means for sending a request message to a content sharing system(para. 0004,0042,0044).

Dunko however does not explicitly teach user-selectable option to facilitate, wherein the request message is based on information associated with the user-selectable option; means for receiving a user input form from the content sharing system, wherein the user input form is configured to obtain user input identifying

recipients for the shared content; and means for sending information associated with the completed user input form to the content sharing system.

Freeze teaches user-selectable option to facilitate, wherein the request message is based on information associated with the user-selectable option(page 101-103); means for receiving a user input form from the content sharing system, wherein the user input form is configured to obtain user input identifying recipients for the shared content(page 101-103); and means for sending information associated with the completed user input form to the content sharing system(page 101-103).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Dunko to include user-selectable option to facilitate, wherein the request message is based on information associated with the user-selectable option; means for receiving a user input form from the content sharing system, wherein the user input form is configured to obtain user input identifying recipients for the shared content; and means for sending information associated with the completed user input form to the content sharing system as taught by Freeze in order to send an email to a user.

One ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have been motivated to combine the teachings of Dunko and Freeze in order to provide a system to send content through an email.

As per claim 13, the mobile device of claim 12 further comprising means for, after sending the information associated with the completed user input form, receiving a

message indicating the status of the request sent to the content sharing system(Dunko, para.0045).

As per claim 14, the mobile device of claim 12 further comprising means for, after sending the information associated with the completed user input form, representing the content via the output component(Dunko, Figs.1-16).

As per claim 15, the mobile device of claim 12 further comprising means for presenting information from an address book application, wherein the address book application facilitates the identifying of recipients for the shared content in combination with the user input form(Freeze, page 214-219). Motivation to combine set forth in claim 12.

As per claim 16, the mobile device of claim 12 wherein the largest dimension of the mobile device is smaller than twelve inches or does not have a full size keyboard that can accommodate both hands of a user(Dunko, Figs.1-16).

As per claim 17, Dunko teaches at a content provider system, a method of sharing content among users of mobile devices interconnected within one or more mobile telecommunication networks, wherein at least some of the users subscribe to a mobile service provided by a mobile service provider(Figs.1-16), the method comprising: as part of content available for access by users of mobile devices, sharing the content with other users of mobile devices, and wherein; and providing the content, , to a device of a user, wherein the content can then be shared with a recipient device via the content sharing application of the mobile service provider(para. 0004,0042,0044).

Dunko however does not explicitly teach generating a user-selectable share content option; the user-selectable share content option is based on an application program interface provided in association with a content sharing application of the mobile service provider.

Freeze teaches generating a user-selectable share content option; the user-selectable share content option is based on an application program interface provided in association with a content sharing application of the mobile service provider (page 101-103).

. Therefore it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Dunko to include generating a user-selectable share content option; the user-selectable share content option is based on an application program interface provided in association with a content sharing application of the mobile service provider as taught by Freeze in order to send an email to a user.

One ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have been motivated to combine the teachings of Dunko and Freeze in order to provide a system to send content through an email.

As per claim 18, the method of claim 17 wherein the user-selectable share content option is implemented as a link that, when selected, results in a request message being sent to the content sharing application of the mobile service provider(Freeze, page101-103). Motivation to combine set forth in claim 17.

As per claim 19, the method of claim 17 wherein the content available for access by users of mobile devices is an executable application(Dunko, Figs.1-16, para.0004).

As per claim 28, Dunko teaches computer-readable medium containing a data structure for facilitating sharing of content among users of mobile devices(Figs.1-16), the data structure comprising: an indication of content to be shared, wherein the indication of the content to be shared is provided as a parameter associated with a display description provided by a content provider, and wherein the indication of the content to be shared is provided in a framework defined in a content sharing application of a mobile service provider(para.0004,0042,0044).

Dunko does not explicitly teach user-selectable option; and a link associated with a server hosting the content sharing application, wherein the content sharing application receives information associated with the data structure as a result of a user selecting the user-selectable option on the provided display description.

Freeze teaches user-selectable option; and a link associated with a server hosting the content sharing application, wherein the content sharing application receives information associated with the data structure as a result of a user selecting the user-selectable option on the provided display description. (page 101-103).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Dunko to include user-selectable option; and a link associated with a server hosting the content sharing application, wherein the content sharing application receives information associated with the data structure as a result of a user selecting the user-selectable option on the provided display description as taught by Freeze in order to send an email to a user.

One ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have been motivated to combine the teachings of Dunko and Freeze in order to provide a system to send content through an email.

As per claim 29, the computer-readable medium of claim 28 wherein the display description is implemented, at least in part, in HTML(Freeze, page 101-103). Motivation to combine set forth in claim 28.

As per claim 33, the computer-readable medium of claim 28 further comprising an indication of uniform resource locator associated with the content to be shared(Freeze, page 101-103). Motivation to combine set forth in claim 28.

As per claim 34, the computer-readable medium of claim 28 further comprising an indication of a specific uniform resource locator identifying an address for specific content to be shared(Freeze, page 101-103). Motivation to combine set forth in claim 28.

As per claim 36, the computer-readable medium of claim 28 further comprising an indication of a return uniform resource locator identifying the address of the display description to which the user will be returned after performing a process associated with identifying recipients with whom to share content(Freeze, page 101-103). Motivation to combine set forth in claim 28.

As per claim 37, Dunko teaches a method for facilitating the sharing of content among users of mobile devices(Figs.1-16), the method comprising: providing an application program interface for content providers, wherein the application program interface provides a framework for content providers to customers of a wireless service

provider to share information with mobile device users(Figs.1-160; and providing a

content sharing application, wherein the content sharing application receives and

processes requests from the customers of the wireless service provider to share content

with the mobile device users(para.0004,0042,0044).

Dunko does not explicitly teach option for user to provide content.

Freeze teaches option for user to provide content (page 101-103).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time of

the invention to modify the teachings of Dunko to option for user to provide content as

taught by Freeze in order to send an email to a user.

One ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have been

motivated to combine the teachings of Dunko and Freeze in order to provide a system

to send content through an email.


Claims 4,5, 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

US Publication 2004/0087326 issued to Dunko et al.(Dunko) in view of *Microsoft

Internet Explorer 5 in 24 Hours*, Jill T. Freeze, Sams Publishing Copyright 1999 in

further view of Office Notice.


Dunko in view of Freeze does not explicitly teach as per 4, the method of claim 1

wherein the content sharing system is associated with a wireless carrier and wherein

the wireless carrier provides mobile service for the mobile device of the recipient, and

as per claim 5, the method of claim 1 wherein the content sharing system is associated

with a wireless carrier and wherein the wireless carrier does not provide mobile service

for the mobile device of the recipient.

Office Notice is taken. It is well known to one ordinary skill in the art at the time

of the invention that there are different wireless carrier provider that provides service to

users. The sender and recipient of the content can use the same wireless provider or

they can be with different wireless provider. Therefore it would have been obvious to

one ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Dunko

in view of Freeze to include using either the same or different wireless service provider

for users in the network in order to provide a system that does not limit users to one

carrier provider.

One ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have been

motivated combine the teachings of Dunko and Freeze, and to either use the same or

different wireless provider in order for users in the network in order to provide a system

that does not limit users to one carrier provider.

Dunkow in view of Freeze does not explicitly teach as per as per claim 10, the

method of claim 1 wherein the user input form provided for display to the user includes

a listing of a predetermined number of recipients with whom the user recently shared

content.

Office Notice is taken. It is well known to one ordinary skill in the art at the time

of the invention to provide a list of recipients that the user have shared content with (e.g.

sent list of SMS messages in a user's mobile phone). Therefore it would have been

obvious to one ordinary skill in the art to modify the teachings of Dunko in view of

Freeze to include a list of recently sent messages in order for the user to keep track of who he/she has sent messages to.

One ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have been motivated combine the teachings of Dunko and Freeze, and to have a list of recently sent messages in order to provide a system where a user can keep track of recently sent messages.


Claims 20,30-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Publication 2004/0087326 issued to Dunko et al.(Dunko) in view of *Microsoft Internet Explorer 5 in 24 Hours*, Jill T. Freeze, Sams Publishing Copyright 1999 in further view of US Publication 2004/0186883 issued to Nyman et al.(Nyman).


Dunko in view of Freeze does not explicitly teach as per claim 20, the method of claim 17 wherein the content available for access by users of mobile devices is an executable MIDP application; and as per claims 30-32, the computer-readable medium of claim 28 wherein the display description is implemented, at least in part, in XML, XHTML, WML.

Nyman teaches as per claim 20, the method of claim 17 wherein the content available for access by users of mobile devices is an executable MIDP application(para.0047); and as per claims 30-32, the computer-readable medium of claim 28 wherein the display description is implemented, at least in part, in XML, XHTML, WML(para.0040).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Dunko in view of Freeze to include wherein the content available for access by users of mobile devices is an executable MIDP application and wherein the display description is implemented, at least in part, in XML, XHTML, WML as taught by Nyman in order to view different webpages.

One ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the teachings of Dunko, Freeze, Nyman in order to provide a system to users to view webpages that have different markup languages.

Claims 38,39,40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Publication 2004/0087326 issued to Dunko et al.(Dunko) in view of *Microsoft Internet Explorer 5 in 24 Hours*, Jill T. Freeze, Sams Publishing Copyright 1999 in further view of US Publication 2004/0193691 issued to Chang.

Dunko in view of Freeze does not explicitly teach as per claim 38, the method of claim 37 further comprising charging a fee to the content providers for providing the option for the customers of the wireless service provider to share information with the mobile device users.

Chang teaches charging a fee to the content providers for providing the option for the customers of the wireless service provider to share information with the mobile device users(para.0008).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Dunko in view of Freeze to include charging a fee to the content providers for providing the option for the customers of the wireless service provider to share information with the mobile device users as taught by Chang in order to charge for use of a system.

One ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the teachings of Dunko, Freeze Chang in order to charge for use of a system.

As per claim 39, the method of claim 37 further comprising tracking attempts of the customers of the wireless service provider to share content with the mobile device users and charging a fee in association with the attempts(Chang, para.0008). Motivation to combine set forth in claim 38.

As per claim 40, the method of claim 37 further comprising providing incentives to customers of the wireless service provider to share content with the mobile device users(Chang, para.0029). Motivation to combine set forth in claim 38.


Claims 7,8,11,35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Publication 2004/0087326 issued to Dunko et al.(Dunko) in view of *Microsoft Internet Explorer 5 in 24 Hours*, Jill T. Freeze, Sams Publishing Copyright 1999 in further view of US Publication 2003/0186680 issued to Bhasin et al.(Bhasin).

Dunko in view of Freeze does not explicitly teach as per claim 7, the method of claim 1 further comprising authenticating the user and as per claim 8, the method of claim 1 further comprising authenticating the recipient.

Bhasin teaches the use of user's ID and password for login(para.0016).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Dunko in view of Freeze to include authentication of users as taught by Bhasin in order to map a user to a gateway server to obtain information.

One ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the teachings of Dunko, Freeze and Bhasin in order to provide a system to users to access information on certain servers.

Dunko in view of Freeze does not explicitly teach as per claim 11, the method of claim 1 wherein the received request message is in the form of an HTTP GET request.

Bhasin teaches HTTP GET request(para.0016).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Dunko in view of Freeze to include HTTP GET request as taught by Bhasin in order to obatain information from a server.

One ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the teachings of Dunko, Freeze and Bhasin in order to obtain information from a server.

As per claim 35, the computer-readable medium of claim 28 further comprising an indication of whether the content provider consents to providing access to the shared

content to a cross-carrier user(para.0016; the user must know the password and ID in order to access the server for content).


Claim 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Publication 2004/0087326 issued to Dunko et al.(Dunko) in view of *Microsoft Internet Explorer 5 in 24 Hours*, Jill T. Freeze, Sams Publishing Copyright 1999 in further view of US Publication 2003/0026432 issued to Woodward.


Dunko in view of Freeze does not explicitly teach as per claim 9, the method of claim 1 further comprising determining whether the user has exceeded a predetermined threshold for sharing content.

Woodward teaches determining whether the user has exceeded a predetermined threshold for sharing content(Abstract).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Dunko in view of Freeze to include determining whether the user has exceeded a predetermined threshold for sharing content as taught by Woodward in order for piracy protection of content.

One ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the teachings of Dunko, Freeze, and Woodward in order for piracy protection of content.

Claim 21,22,24, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

US Publication 2004/0087326 issued to Dunko et al.(Dunko) in view of US Patent

6,047,327 issued to Tso et al.(Tso).


As per claim 21, Dunko teaches wireless service provider system for facilitating

the sharing of content among mobile device users via one or more networks(Figs.1-16),

the system comprising:

wherein the content sharing application receives and processes requests to

share content among the mobile device users, and wherein the requests are received

from customers of the wireless service provider system(Figs.1-16,

para.0004,0042,0044); and

multiple network gateways for facilitating the communication between the

content sharing application and the mobile device users, wherein at least one of the

multiple gateways is configured for facilitating communication between the content

sharing application and mobile devices of the mobile device users via a mobile device

telecommunication network, and wherein at least one of the multiple gateways is

configured for facilitating communication between the content sharing application and

computing devices connected via a public communication network(Figs.1-16,

para.0004,0042,0044).

Dunko however does not explicitly teach  a server computer; a database coupled

to the server computer;  a content sharing application running on the server computer

and having access to the database.

Tso teaches a server computer; a database coupled to the server computer; a

content sharing application running on the server computer and having access to the

database(Fig.1col.14, lines 25-35).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time of

the invention to modify the teachings of Dunko to include a server computer; a database

coupled to the server computer; a content sharing application running on the server

computer and having access to the database as taught by Tso in order to distribute

information among different users.

One ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the teachings

of Dunko and Tso in order to distribute information among different users.

As per claim 22, the system of claim 21 wherein the multiple network gateways

include a mobile access gateway(Dunko, Figs.1-16).

As per claim 24, the system of claim 21 wherein the multiple network gateways

include a short message peer-to-peer gateway(Tso, col.14, lines 25-35).


Claims 23,25-27, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over US Publication 2004/0087326 issued to Dunko et al.(Dunko) in view of US Patent

6,047,327 issued to Tso et al.(Tso) in further view of Office Notice.


Dunko in view of Tso does not explicitly teach as per claim 23, the system of

claim 21 wherein the multiple network gateways include a push proxy gateway; as per

claim 25, the system of claim 21 wherein the multiple network gateways include a wireless service broker.

Office Notice is taken. It well known in the art that push proxy and wireless service broker are common gateways in a wireless network.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Dunko in view of Tso to include different types of wireless gateways in order to send information from one mobile device to another.

One ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the teachings of Dunko, Tso, and the user of different types of wireless gateways in a wireless network in order to provide a system to send information over a wireless network.

Dunko in view of Tso does not explicitly teach as per claims 26, the system of claim 21 further comprising a cross-carrier application accessible by the content sharing application, wherein the cross-carrier application facilitates the sharing of content with recipients not registered with the content sharing application.

Office Notice is taken. It well known in the art to one ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention that users of different wireless carrier can share content with one another.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Dunko in view of Tso to include sharing information among users with different wireless provider in order to provide a system where one is not limited to one wireless provider.

One ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the teachings of Dunko, Tso, and sharing information among users with different wireless provider in order to provide a system where one is not limited to one wireless provider.

Dunko in view of Tso does not explicitly teach as per claim 27, the system of claim 21 further comprising an address book application accessible by the content sharing application.

Office Notice is taken. It well known in the art to one ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention that an application can access an address book for sharing.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Dunko in view of Tso to include an application accessing an address book for sharing of content in order to provide a system where a user can send information to other users without having to remember their address.

One ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the teachings of Dunko, Tso, and an application accessing an address book for sharing of content in order to provide a system where a user can send information to other users without having to remember their address.

## Conclusion

**Examiner's Note**: Examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers in the references as applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings of the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant in preparing

responses, to fully consider the references in its entirety as potentially teaching of all or part of the claimed invention.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. See PTO-892.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Backhean Tiv whose telephone number is (571) 272-5654. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 6:30-3:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached on (571) 272-3964. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

BackheanTiv
2151
10/1/07

JOHN FOLLANSBEE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100